## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

CORTEZ N. MEADOWS,	)
Plaintiff,	)
v.	) Case No. CIV-17-226-G
CITY OF OKLAHOMA CITY et al.,	)
Defendants.	)

## **ORDER**

Now before the Court are Plaintiff's Motions in Limine (Doc. Nos. 82, 84) and Plaintiff's Motions to Amend his Motions in Limine (Doc. Nos. 86, 87). Defendants have responded in opposition (Doc. Nos. 90, 91, 92), and Plaintiff has replied (Doc. Nos. 93, 94). Plaintiff filed these motions before the Court established any discovery deadlines in this matter. As of this date, there is no trial setting. Nor has the Court set the deadlines for standard pretrial motions, including the deadline for motions in limine. *See* Scheduling Order (Doc. No. 97) at 2.1

The purpose of a motion in limine "is to allow the Court to decide evidentiary issues in advance of trial." *Dry Clean Super Ctr., Inc. v. Kwik Indus., Inc.*, No. 08-cv-00578-WJM-CBS, 2012 WL 503510, at \*4 (D. Colo. Feb. 15, 2012). Because the posture of this action may change upon disposition of currently pending motions, *see* Doc. Nos. 98, 99, 100, and because it is too early to determine the specific context in which potential evidence

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This action is not currently on the Court's September Trial Docket. Rather, as advised in the Scheduling Order, the Court shall set a pretrial conference (if necessary) to determine the trial setting and other pretrial motion deadlines following the Court's ruling on any dispositive motions. *See id.* 

might be introduced at trial, the Court denies Plaintiff's Motions in Limine as premature, without prejudice to refiling at a later date.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motions in Limine (Doc. Nos. 82, 84) are DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE as premature. Plaintiff's Motions to Amend his Motions in Limine (Doc. Nos. 86, 87) are DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 28th day of June, 2019.

CHARLES B. GOODWIN United States District Judge